

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested. Claims 1, 8, 13 and 14 have been amended. As such, claims 1-14 are in this application and are presented for the Examiner's consideration in view of the following comments.

The specification has been amended to provide a reference to related, copending, applications.

In terms of the claim amendments, the amendments to claims 1, 8 and 13, are described below; while claim 14 has been amended to correctly depend from claim 13.

Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 12, 13 and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,535,717 issued March 18, 2003 to Matsushima et al. (*Matsushima*). Applicants respectfully disagree.

With respect to Applicants' claim 1, the Examiner states that *Matsushima* describes Applicant's claimed

encoding a second signal representing the content using encoding relatively more robust than the encoding of the first encoded content representative signal.

Respectfully, the Examiner is wrong. In particular, the Examiner points to encoders 5a and 5b of *Matsushima* and col.9, lns. 5-14 and 42-50. However, nowhere do the cited passages in *Matsushima* describe, or suggest, "encoding a second signal representing the content using encoding relatively more robust than the encoding of the first encoded content representative signal" as required by Applicants' claim 1. Indeed, col. 9, lns. 5-14, of *Matsushima*, states:

[w]hen the transmitting means 3 transmits the high quality signal and the low quality signals, the transmitting means 3 delays the timing of transmission of the high quality signal with respect to the low quality signals, which are created from the same broadcasting digital data. Then, the transmitting means 3 multiplexes the plurality of channels of signals in terms of data arrangement. In order to accomplish the delay and multiplexing operation, the transmitting means 3 includes delaying means 4, encoding means 5a, 5b, and multiplexing communication means 10.

Matsushima, col. 9, lns. 5-14, emphasis added.

As underlined above, the encoding means of *Matsushima* has nothing to do with the quality of the signal and is simply a part of the delay and multiplexing operation. Likewise, col. 9, lns. 40-60, of *Matsushima*, states:

[t]he multiplexing communication means 10 effects multiplexing operation on the high quality data generated from the encoding means 5a and at least one output from the encoding means 5b (actually a plurality of signals) of low quality data, inserts error correction code, modulates and transmits the resulting signal as a radio wave signal. In order to accomplish the above operation, the multiplexing communication means 10 includes a multiplexer (multiplexing means) for multiplexing a high quality data signal channel N-ch generated from the encoding means 5a and at least one low quality data signal channel group A-ch (A1-ch, A2-ch, . . . , An-ch) generated from the encoding means 5b, an error correction code inserting means 7 for carrying out interleave processing on data multiplexed by the multiplexer 6 and inserting an error correction code such as Viterbi code or Reed-Solomon code or the like, modulating means 8 for modulating signal data generated from the error correction code inserting means 7, frequency conversion amplifying means 9 for effecting up-converting on the signal modulated by the modulating means 8 and amplifies the same for transmission, and a parabolic antenna 50b for transmitting the modulated signal amplified for transmission.

Matsushima, col. 9, lns. 40-60, emphasis added.

Again, this portion of *Matsushima* merely describes that encoder 5a generates high quality encoded data – but not because the encoding is more robust **but because encoder 5a receives the high quality data for encoding**, which is clearly shown in FIG. 5, of *Matsushima*. Indeed, there is no description, or suggestion, in *Matsushima*, that encoder 5a and encoder 5b perform different encoding as required by Applicants' claim 1.

In fact, the Examiner's comment that in *Matsushima* the "encoder encodes the second signal with a robust technique being a lower quality encoding" is simply not supported by *Matsushima*. Clear reference to FIG. 5, of *Matsushima*, shows that in terms of "quality", the low quality signal, e.g., with less resolution, is generated by element 2, in FIG. 5, of *Matsushima*, before application to the encoding means 5b. In fact, simply because encoding means 5b, of *Matsushima*, encodes a lower quality signal has no bearing on the encoding means of 5b being more, or less robust, compared to the encoding means of 5a. As such, the only thing that FIG. 5, of

Matsushima, shows is that encoding means 5b encodes a lower quality signal. This does not translate into a lower quality encoding as suggested by the Examiner.

Notwithstanding the above, in the interests of furthering prosecution, Applicants have amended claim 1 to require “multiplexing the first and second encoded signals in the time domain”. (Applicants’ specification, p. 6, lns. 17-19.) In contrast, *Matsushima* describes a method and apparatus for using additional bandwidth by creating additional frequency channels. (*Matsushima*, col. 13. 17-26.) As such, *Matsushima* does not describe, or suggest, multiplexing in the time domain as required by Applicants’ claim 1.

Similar comments apply to Applicants’ remaining independent claims 8 and 13.

In view of the above, Applicants’ independent claims 1, 8 and 13 are not anticipated by *Matsushima*. As such, dependent claims 2, 7, 12 and 14 are also in condition for allowance.

Claims 3-6 and 9-11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Matsushima* in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0181581 published December 5, 2002 to Birru et al. Applicants respectfully disagree for the reasons described above with respect to independent claims 1 and 8.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Applicants' attorney in order to overcome any additional objections that the Examiner might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 07-0832 therefor.

Respectfully submitted
Kumar Ramaswamy et al.

By /Joseph J. Opalach/

Joseph J. Opalach
Registration No.: 36,229

Application No. 10/543,044

PU030044

(609) 734-6839

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing LLC.
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312
September 20, 2010